

Appl. No. 10/707,494  
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 24, 2006

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

#### 1. Request for reconsideration of the finality of the Office action:

The applicant submits that the most recent Office action dated February 24, 2006 was prematurely made final. As explained in the applicant's amendment filed October 7, 2005, new claim 19 was drafted to include only those limitations contained in claims 1 and 7. Claim 7 had been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. Therefore, the rejection of claim 19 was not necessitated by the applicant's amendment since the applicant was merely putting claim 19 in condition for allowance by including the limitations of allowed claim 7. The use of the Yu et al. (US 2004/0257795) patent publication to reject claim 19 constitutes a new rejection that was not necessitated by the applicant's amendment, and therefore the current final rejection is improper. Reconsideration of the finality of the office action is respectfully requested.

#### 15 2. Rejection of claims 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yu et al. (US 2004/0257795).

#### Response:

20 Claim 19 has been amended to overcome this rejection. Claim 19 now contains the limitations of a protruding device formed on top of the elastic device for flexibly supporting the diffuser. Because the elastic device on which the protruding device sits is flexible, the protruding device can properly support the diffuser without damaging the diffuser even when the diffuser sags.

25

On the other hand, Yu does not teach that the support 120 flexibly supports the diffuser plate 140. As shown in Fig. 4a and Fig. 4b, the support 120 comprises a curved

Appl. No. 10/707,494  
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 24, 2006

surface 121a, extending portions 122b, and elastic portions 122a. The extending portions 122b and the elastic portions 122a are merely used for fixing the support 120 in the through hole 111 of the reflector 110 (paragraph 30 of Yu). The elastic portions 122b offer no flexible support for the diffuser plate 140. Furthermore, the curved surface 121a and  
5 the extending portions 122b also do not offer flexible support for the diffuser plate 140. Therefore, the structure and function of Yu's support 120 differs from that of the claimed elastic device and protruding device recited in claim 19.

For these reasons, the applicant submits that claim 19 is patentable over Yu. Claims  
10 20-22 are dependent on claim 19, and should be allowed if claim 19 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 19-22 is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu and  
15 further in view of Lee (US 6,902,300).

**Response:**

Claim 23 is dependent on claim 19, and should be allowed if claim 19 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

20

4. Introduction to new claims 28-31:

New claim 28 is drafted using the limitations of previously presented claims 19 and 24, and new claim 29 is a duplicate of claim 25. Similarly, new claim 30 is drafted using the limitations of previously presented claims 19 and 26, and new claim 31 is a duplicate  
25 of claim 27. Both claims 24 and 26 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. Therefore, all new claims 28-31 are in allowable form.

The applicant submits that all pending claims are now in allowable form, and

Appl. No. 10/707,494  
Amdt. dated April 26, 2006  
Reply to Office action of February 24, 2006

respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,

5 Winston Hsu

Date: 04.26.2006

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)

15